arXiv:1210.5769v2 [math.AP] 30 Dec 2012

# On Spherically Symmetric Motions of a Gaseous Star Governed by the Euler-Poisson Equations

Tetu Makino

December 31, 2012

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1

We consider spherically symmetric motions of a gaseous star governed by the Euler-Poisson equations:

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t}+u\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial r}+\rho\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}+\frac{2}{r}\rho u=0,\\ &\rho(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}+u\frac{\partial u}{\partial r})+\frac{\partial P}{\partial r}=-\rho\frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial r}\qquad (0<t,0<r),\\ &\frac{1}{r^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\Big(r^2\frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial r}\Big)=4\pi g_0\rho.\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

Here $\rho$ is the density, $u$ the velocity, $P$ the pressure, $\Phi$ the gravitational potential, and $g_0$ is the gravitational constant. In this work we assume

$$P=A\rho^\gamma,\tag{2}$$

where $A$ and $\gamma$ are positive constants, and we assume $1<\gamma\leq 2$.

Introducing the mass

$$m:=4\pi\int_0^r\rho(t,r')r'^2dr',$$

we can write the equations as

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t}+u\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial r}+\rho\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}+\frac{2}{r}\rho u=0,\\ &\rho(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}+u\frac{\partial u}{\partial r})+\frac{\partial P}{\partial r}=-g_0\frac{\rho m}{r^2}.\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

On the other hand, equilibria for the equations (1) are governed by the ordinary differential equation

$$-\frac{1}{r^2}\frac{d}{dr}\Big(\frac{r^2}{\rho}\frac{dP}{dr}\Big)=4\pi g_0\rho,$$

which is called the Lane-Emden equation. The following result on this Lane-Emden equation is well-known:

**Lemma 1** *Assume* $6/5<\gamma\leq 2$*. For any positive number* $\rho_0$ *given, there is an equilibrium* $\rho=\bar{\rho}(r)$ *with positive numbers* $R,\rho_1$ *such that* $\bar{\rho}(r)$ *is positive and analytic in* $0<r<R$ *and*

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\rho}(r)&=\rho_0(1+[r^2]_1)\qquad\text{as } r\rightarrow 0,\\ \bar{\rho}(r)&=\rho_1(R-r)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}(1+[R-r,(R-r)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}]_1)\qquad\text{as } r\rightarrow R-0.\end{aligned}$$

**Notational Remark.** Here and hereafter $[X]_q$ denotes a power series of the form $\sum_{j\geq q}a_jX^j$ with positive radius of convergence, and $[X,Y]_q$ a convergent power series of the form $\sum_{j+k\geq q}a_{jk}X^jY^k$.

**Remark**. In the expansion of $\bar{\rho}(r)$ as $r\rightarrow R$, the terms including $(R-r)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}$ actually appear if $\dfrac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}$ is not an integer. Let us prove it. Otherwise we would have

$$\bar{\rho}(r)=\rho_1(R-r)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}(1+[R-r]_1)$$

and the function

$$U(r):=\bar{\rho}(r)^{\gamma-1}=\rho_1^{\gamma-1}(R-r)(1+[R-r]_1)$$

would be analytic at $r=R$. Now $U$ satisfies

$$-\frac{d^2U}{dr^2}-\frac{2}{r}\frac{dU}{dr}=\frac{4\pi g_0(\gamma-1)}{A\gamma}U^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}.$$

Since $U$ is analytic, the left-hand side is analytic, and so, the right-hand side

$$\frac{4\pi g_0(\gamma-1)}{A\gamma}\rho_1(R-r)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}(1+[R-r]_1)$$

would be analytic at $r=R$. Then $\dfrac{1}{\gamma-1}$ shoud be an integer. This contradicts to that $\dfrac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}=\dfrac{1}{\gamma-1}+1$ is not an integer.

Moreover if we write $R=R(\rho_0),\rho_1=\rho_1(\rho_0)$ as functions of $\rho_0$, then we have

$$R(\rho_0)=\rho_0^{\frac{\gamma-2}{2}}R(1),\qquad\rho_1(\rho_0)=\rho_0^{\frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma-1)}}\rho_1(1).$$

In fact $\rho(r)=K^{\frac{2}{\gamma-2}}\bar{\rho}(r/K)$ is an equilibrium, too, for any $K>0$ and any equilibrium $\bar{\rho}(\cdot)$.

For a proof of Lemma 1, see, e.g., [4], and [5], Chapter V or [9], Chapter IX.

## 1.2

In the following discussion we assume that $6/5 < \gamma \leq 2$ and we fix an equilibrium $\bar{\rho}(r)$ with the properties in the above Lemma. Put $\bar{P}(r) = A\bar{\rho}(r)^{\gamma}$.

We are going to construct solutions around this fixed equilibrium. To do so, we take the Lagrangian mass coordinate $m$ as the independent variable instead of $r$. Then we can write the equations as

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + 4\pi\rho^2(r^2u)_m = 0, \\ &\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + 4\pi r^2 P_m = -g_0\frac{m}{r^2}, \\ &r = \Big(\frac{3}{4\pi}\int_0^m \frac{dm}{\rho}\Big)^{1/3}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\frac{\partial r}{\partial t} = u, \qquad \frac{\partial r}{\partial m} = \frac{1}{4\pi\rho r^2},$$

the equations are reduced to the single second order equation

$$r_{tt} + 4\pi r^2 P_m = -g_0\frac{m}{r^2}, \tag{4}$$

where

$$P = A\Big(4\pi r^2\frac{\partial r}{\partial m}\Big)^{-\gamma}.$$

Now we derive the equation for the perturbation $y$ defined by

$$r = \bar{r}(1+y). \tag{5}$$

Here $\bar{r}(m)$ is the function of the Lagrangian mass variable $m$ associated with the fixed equilibrium. In other words, it is the inverse function of

$$m = \bar{m}(r) = 4\pi\int_0^r \bar{\rho}(r')r'^2dr'.$$

Keeping in mind

$$\frac{\partial r}{\partial m} = \frac{\partial \bar{r}}{\partial m}\Big(1 + y + \frac{\bar{r}}{\bar{r}_m}\frac{\partial y}{\partial m}\Big),$$

we have

$$P = \bar{P}\Big(1 - G(y, \frac{\bar{r}}{\bar{r}_m}\frac{\partial y}{\partial m})\Big).$$

Here $G(y,v) = 3\gamma y + \gamma v + [y,v]_2$ is defined by

$$(1+y)^{-2\gamma}(1+y+v)^{-\gamma} = 1 - G(y,v).$$

Then the equation is reduced to

$$\bar{r}y_{tt} + \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}}(1+y)^2\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{r}}\Big(\bar{P}\Big(1 - G(y, \bar{r}\frac{\partial y}{\partial\bar{r}})\Big)\Big) + g_0\frac{m}{\bar{r}^2(1+y)^2} = 0,$$

where we have used

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial m} = \bar{r}_m\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{r}} = \frac{1}{4\pi\bar{\rho}\bar{r}^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{r}}.$$

We note that the equilibrium satisfies

$$\frac{1}{\bar{\rho}}\frac{\partial\bar{P}}{\partial\bar{r}} + g_0\frac{m}{\bar{r}^2} = 0.$$

Let us introduce $H(y) = 4y + [y]_2$ by

$$H(y) = (1+y)^2 - \frac{1}{(1+y)^2}.$$

Then the equation can be written as

$$\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t^2} - \frac{1}{\rho r}(1+y)^2\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\Big(PG(y, r\frac{\partial y}{\partial r})\Big) + \frac{1}{\rho r}P_r H(y) = 0. \tag{6}$$

Here we have ued the abreviations $r, \rho, P, P_r$ instead of $\bar{r}, \bar{\rho}, \bar{P}, d\bar{P}/d\bar{r}$. We consider this nonlinear wave equation.

It is easy to verify by a scale transformation of variables that we can assume

$$R = 1, \qquad A = \frac{1}{\gamma}$$

without loss of generality. Hence we shall assume so, and we consider the equation (6) on the interval $(0,1)$ of the variable $r$, and we assume that

$$\begin{aligned}\rho &= \rho_0(1 + [r^2]_1) \qquad \text{as } r \to 0, \\ \rho &= \rho_1(1-r)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}(1 + [1-r, (1-r)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}]_1) \qquad \text{as } r \to 1\end{aligned}$$

and

$$P = \frac{1}{\gamma}\rho^\gamma.$$

# 2 Analysis of the linearized equation

## 2.1

The linearized equation is

$$\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t^2} + \mathcal{L}y = 0, \tag{7}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}y &:= -\frac{1}{\rho r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\Big(P\Big(3\gamma y + \gamma r\frac{\partial y}{\partial r}\Big)\Big) + \frac{1}{\rho r}P_r\cdot(4y) \\ &= -\frac{1}{\rho r^4}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\Big(\gamma r^4 P\frac{\partial y}{\partial r}\Big) + \frac{1}{\rho r}(4-3\gamma)P_r y, \qquad (8)\end{aligned}$$

and the associated eigenvalue problem is

$$\mathcal{L}y = \lambda y.$$

Let us use the Liouville transformation:

$$\xi := \int_0^r \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{\gamma P}}dr, \qquad \eta := r^2(\gamma P\rho)^{\frac{1}{4}}y.$$

Through this transformation the equation

$$\mathcal{L}y = \lambda y + f$$

turns out to be the standard form

$$-\frac{d^2\eta}{d\xi^2} + q\eta = \lambda\eta + g,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} q &= \frac{\gamma P}{\rho}\Big(\frac{2}{r^2} + \Big(\frac{7-3\gamma}{2} + \frac{1+\gamma}{4}\frac{rm_r}{m}\Big)\frac{\rho_r}{r\rho} + \frac{(\gamma+1)(3-\gamma)}{16}\Big(\frac{\rho_r}{\rho}\Big)^2\Big), \\ g &= r^2(\gamma P\rho)^{\frac{1}{4}}f. \end{aligned}$$

The variable $\xi$ runs on the interval $(0, \xi_+)$, where

$$\xi_+ := \int_0^1 \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{\gamma P}}dr < \infty.$$

Since

$$\xi \sim \sqrt{\frac{\rho_0}{\gamma P_0}}r \qquad \text{as } r \to 0,$$

we see

$$q \sim \frac{\gamma P_0}{\rho_0}\frac{2}{r^2} \sim \frac{2}{\xi^2} \qquad \text{as } \xi \to 0.$$

Since

$$\frac{\rho_r}{\rho} \sim -\frac{1}{\gamma-1}(1-r)^{-1}, \qquad \frac{\gamma P}{\rho} \sim \rho_1^{\gamma-1}(1-r) \qquad \text{as } r \to 1-0,$$

and

$$1 - r \sim \frac{1}{4}\rho_1^{\gamma-1}(\xi_+ - \xi)^2 \qquad \text{as } \xi \to \xi_+ - 0,$$

we see

$$q \sim \frac{\gamma P}{\rho}\frac{(\gamma+1)(3-\gamma)}{16}\Big(\frac{\rho_r}{\rho}\Big)^2 \sim \frac{1}{4}\frac{(1+\gamma)(3-\gamma)}{(\gamma-1)^2}\frac{1}{(\xi_+ - \xi)^2}$$

as $\xi \to \xi_+ - 0$. It follows from $1 < \gamma < 2$ that

$$\frac{1}{4}\frac{(1+\gamma)(3-\gamma)}{(\gamma-1)^2} > \frac{3}{4}.$$

Of course $q$ is bounded from below, but it is difficult to know whether its minimum is positive or not. Anyway, the both boundary points $\xi = 0, \xi_+$ are of limit point type. See, e.g., [8], p.159, Theorem X.10. The exceptional case $\gamma = 2$ will be dicussed later. Hence we have the following conclusion:

**Proposition 1** *The operator* $T_0, \mathcal{D}(T_0) = C_0^\infty(0, \xi_+), T_0\eta = -\eta_{\xi\xi} + q\eta$, *in* $L^2(0, \xi_+)$ *has the Friedrichs extension* $T$*, a self-adjoint operator, whose spectrum consists of simple eigenvalues* $\lambda_1 < \cdots < \lambda_n < \lambda_{n+1} < \cdots \to +\infty$*.*

In other words, *the operator* $A_0, \mathcal{D}(A_0) = C_0^\infty(0,1), A_0 y = \mathcal{L}y$ *in* $L^2((0,1), r^4\rho dr)$ *has the Friedrichs extension* $A$*, a self-adjoint operator with eigenvalues* $(\lambda_n)_n$*.*

The domain $\mathcal{D}(T)$ of the Firedrichs extension $T$ is, by definition,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}(T) = \{\eta \in L^2(0,\xi_+) \quad | \quad & \exists \phi_n \in C_0^\infty(0,\xi_+), \quad Q[\phi_m - \phi_n] \to 0 \\ & \text{as } m, n \to \infty, \quad \phi_n \to \eta \quad \text{in } L^2(0,\xi_+) \\ & \text{and } -\eta_{\xi\xi} + q\eta \in L^2(0,\xi_+) \quad \text{in distribution sense}\},\end{aligned}$$

where

$$Q[\phi] := \int_0^{\xi_+} \Big(\Big|\frac{d\phi}{dx}\Big|^2 + (q+c)|\phi|^2\Big) d\xi,$$

and $c$ is a constant $> |\min q|$. But $\mathcal{D}(T)$ is characterized as follows:

$$\mathcal{D}(T) = \{\eta \in C[0,\xi_+] \quad | \quad \eta(0) = \eta(\xi_+) = 0, \quad -\eta_{\xi\xi} + q\eta \in L^2(0,\xi_+)\}.$$

Let us prove it, denoting by $M$ the right-hand side. Let $\eta \in \mathcal{D}(T)$. Then there are $\phi_n \in C_0^\infty(0,\xi_+)$ such that $\phi_n \to \eta$ in $L^2$ and $Q[\phi_m - \phi_n] \to 0$. Since

$$|\phi_m(\xi) - \phi_n(\xi)| \le \sqrt{\xi} \int_0^\xi ((\phi_m - \phi_n)_\xi)^2 d\xi \le \sqrt{\xi} Q[\phi_m - \phi_n] \to 0,$$

we have $\phi_n \to \eta$ uniformly on $[0,\xi_+]$. Hence $\eta \in C[0,\xi_+]$ and $\eta(0) = 0$. Similarly $\eta(\xi_+) = 0$. Thus $\mathcal{D}(T) \subset M$. Let $\eta \in M$. Put $f := -\eta_{\xi\xi} + q\eta \in L^2$. Then $-\eta_{\xi\xi} + (q+c)\eta = g := f + c\eta \in L^2$. since 0 belongs to the resolvent set of $T + c$, we have $v := (T+c)^{-1}g \in \mathcal{D}(T)$. Hence $w := \eta - v \in C[0,\xi_+]$ and $w(0) = w(\xi_+) = 0, -w_{\xi\xi} + (q+c)w = 0$, for $\mathcal{D}(T) \subset M$. Using $q + c > 0$, we can deduce that $w \equiv 0$ and $\eta = v \in \mathcal{D}(T)$, that is, $M \subset \mathcal{D}(T)$. (In fact, if $w$ did not vanish identically, there would exist $a \in (0,\xi_+)$ such that $Dw(a) = 0$ and $w(a) \neq 0$. If $w(a) > 0$, then

$$Dw(\xi) = \int_a^\xi D^2 w(\xi')d\xi' = \int_a^\xi (q+c)w(\xi')d\xi'$$

implies $Dw(\xi) > 0$ for $a < \xi < \xi_+$ and it contradicts to $w(\xi_+) = 0$. If $w(a) < 0$, then

$$Dw(\xi) = -\int_\xi^a (q+c)w(\xi')d\xi'$$

implies $Dw(\xi) > 0$ for $0 < \xi < a$ and it contradicts to $w(0) = 0$.) ■

Although it is not easy to judge the signature of $\min q$, we have the stability result by S.-S. Lin, [6], 1997, as follows:

**Proposition 2** *If and only if* $4/3 < \gamma \leq 2$, *the least eigenvalue* $\lambda_1$ *is positive.*

**Proof**: The function $y \equiv 1$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}y = \frac{1}{\rho r}(4 - 3\gamma)P_r > 0.$$

Let us consider the corresponding function

$$\eta_1 = r^2(\gamma P \rho)^{\frac{1}{4}}$$

thorugh the Liouville transformation. It is easy to show that $\eta_1$ and $d\eta_1/d\xi$ vanish at $\xi = 0, \xi_+$ and $\eta_1 \in \mathcal{D}(T)$. Let $\phi_1(\xi)$ be the eigenfunction of $-d^2/d\xi^2 + Q$ associated with the least eigenvalue $\lambda_1$. We can assume $\phi_1(\xi) > 0$ for $0 < \xi < \xi_+$ and $\phi_1$ and $d\phi_1/d\xi$ vanish at $\xi = 0, \xi_+$. Then the integration by parts gives

$$\lambda_1 \int_0^{\xi_+} \phi_1 \eta_1 d\xi = \int_0^{\xi_+} \phi_1(-\eta_{1,\xi\xi} + q\eta_1)d\xi.$$

Since

$$-\eta_{1,\xi\xi} + q\eta_1 = r(\gamma P)^{\frac{1}{4}}\rho^{-\frac{3}{4}}(4 - 3\gamma)P_r$$

and $P_r < 0$, we have the assertion. ■

## 2.2

Let us introduce the variable $x$ defined by

$$x := \frac{\tan^2\theta}{1 + \tan^2\theta}, \qquad \theta := \frac{\kappa\xi}{2} = \int_0^r \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{\gamma P}}dr,$$

where $\kappa = \pi/\xi_+$. Then $x$ runs over the interval $[0, 1]$ while $r$ runs over $[0, 1]$, and

$$\frac{dx}{dr} = \kappa\sqrt{x(1-x)}\rho^{\frac{-\gamma+1}{2}}.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dr} &= \kappa\sqrt{x(1-x)}\rho^{\frac{-\gamma+1}{2}}\frac{d}{dx}, \\
\frac{d^2}{dr^2} &= \kappa^2 x(1-x)\rho^{\frac{-\gamma+1}{2}}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \\
&\quad + \Big(\frac{1}{2}\kappa^2(1-2x)\rho^{-\gamma+1} + \frac{-\gamma+1}{2}\kappa\sqrt{x(1-x)}\rho^{\frac{-\gamma-1}{2}}\rho_r\Big)\frac{d}{dx},
\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa^{-2}\mathcal{L}y &= -x(1-x)\frac{d^2y}{dx^2}+ \\ &\quad -\Big(\frac{1}{2}(1-2x)+\frac{\gamma+1}{2}\frac{1}{\kappa}\sqrt{x(1-x)}\rho^{\frac{\gamma-3}{2}}\rho_r+\frac{4}{r}\frac{1}{\kappa}\sqrt{x(1-x)}\rho^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}}\Big)\frac{dy}{dx}+ \\ &\quad +\frac{1}{\kappa^2}\frac{\rho^{\gamma-2}\rho_r}{r}(4-3\gamma)y.\end{aligned}$$

As $r \to 0 (x \to 0)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}x &= \frac{\kappa^2}{4}\rho_0^{-\gamma+1}r^2(1+[r^2]_1), \\ r &= \frac{2}{\kappa}\rho_0^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}}\sqrt{x}(1+[x]_1), \\ \rho_r &= r[r^2]_0, \\ \frac{4}{r}\frac{1}{\kappa}\sqrt{x(1-x)}\rho^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}} &= 2\sqrt{1-x}(1+[x]_1).\end{aligned}$$

Then it follows that

$$\kappa^{-2}\mathcal{L}y = -x(1-x)\frac{d^2y}{dx^2}-\Big(\frac{5}{2}+[x]_1\Big)\frac{dy}{dx}+[x]_0y.$$

On the other hand, as $r \to 1 (x \to 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}1-x &= \kappa^2\rho_1^{-\gamma+1}(1-r)(1+[1-r,(1-r)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}]_1), \\ 1-r &= \kappa^{-2}\rho_1^{\gamma-1}(1-x)(1+[1-x,(1-x)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}]_1), \\ \rho_r &= -\frac{\rho_1}{\gamma-1}(1-r)^{\frac{2-\gamma}{\gamma-1}}(1+[1-r,(1-r)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}]_1).\end{aligned}$$

Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa^{-2}\mathcal{L}y &= -x(1-x)\frac{d^2y}{dx^2}+ \\ &\quad +\Big(\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}+[1-x,(1-x)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}]_1\Big)\frac{dy}{dx}+[1-x,(1-x)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}]_0y.\end{aligned}$$

Changing the scale of $t$, we can and shall assume that $\kappa = 1$ without loss of generality.

Summing up, we have:

**Proposition 3** *We can write*

$$\mathcal{L}y = -x(1-x)\frac{d^2y}{dx^2}+\Big(\frac{5}{2}(1-x)-\frac{N}{2}x\Big)\frac{dy}{dx}+L_1(x)\frac{dy}{dx}+L_0(x)y,$$

*where*

$$\begin{aligned} L_1(x) &= [x]_1, \\ &= [1-x, (1-x)^{\frac{N}{2}}]_1, \\ L_0(x) &= [x]_0, \\ &= [1-x, (1-x)^{\frac{N}{2}}]_0. \end{aligned}$$

Here $N$ is the parameter defined by

$$N = \frac{2\gamma}{\gamma - 1} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \gamma = 1 + \frac{2}{N-2}. \tag{9}$$

## 2.3

Let us consider the simplified linear operator

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda \quad &:= \quad x(1-x)\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \Big(\frac{5}{2}(1-x) - \frac{N}{2}x\Big)\frac{d}{dx} \qquad (10) \\ &= \quad x^{-\frac{3}{2}}(1-x)^{-\frac{N}{2}+1}\frac{d}{dx}x^{\frac{5}{2}}(1-x)^{\frac{N}{2}}\frac{d}{dx} \end{aligned}$$

The function $y \equiv 1$ is a solution of $\Lambda y = 0$ and another independent solution of $\Lambda y = 0$ is given by

$$y = \psi(x) := \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{x} X^{-\frac{5}{2}}(1-X)^{-\frac{N}{2}} dX.$$

We take the Hilbert space $\mathfrak{X}$ of functions of $0 < x < 1$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{X} \quad &= \quad \{y \quad | \quad \|y\|_{\mathfrak{X}} < \infty\}, \\ \|y\|_{\mathfrak{X}} \quad &= \quad \Big(\int_0^1 |y(x)|^2 x^{\frac{3}{2}}(1-x)^{\frac{N}{2}-1}dx\Big)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $y \equiv 1$ belongs to $\mathfrak{X}$ but $\psi$ does not belong to $\mathfrak{X}$. It is easy to prove directly the following

**Proposition 4** *Let $y \in \mathfrak{X}$ satisfy $\Lambda y = f \in \mathfrak{X}$. Then the following formulae hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} y(x) \quad &= \quad \psi(x)\int_0^x f(X)X^{\frac{3}{2}}(1-X)^{\frac{N}{2}-1}dX + \\ &\quad + \int_x^1 \psi(X)f(X)X^{\frac{3}{2}}(1-X)^{\frac{N}{2}-1}dX + C, \qquad (11) \\ &\quad \int_0^1 f(X)X^{\frac{3}{2}}(1-X)^{\frac{N}{2}-1}dX = 0, \qquad (12) \\ \frac{dy}{dx} \quad &= \quad x^{-\frac{5}{2}}(1-x)^{-\frac{N}{2}}\int_0^x f(X)X^{\frac{3}{2}}(1-X)^{\frac{N}{2}-1}dX \qquad (13) \\ &= \quad -x^{-\frac{5}{2}}(1-X)^{-\frac{N}{2}}\int_x^1 f(X)X^{\frac{3}{2}}(1-X)^{\frac{N}{2}-1}dX. \qquad (14) \end{aligned}$$

*Here $C$ is an arbitrary constant.*

## 2.4

Now let us fix a positive eigenvalue $\lambda = \lambda_n$ and an associated eigenfunction $\Phi(r)$ of $\mathcal{L}$. Then

$$y_1(t,r) = \sin\sqrt{\lambda}(t-t_0)\Phi(r)$$

is a time-periodic solution of the linearized problem.

Moreover we can claim that

$$\Phi(r) = C_0(1+[r^2]_1) \qquad \text{as } r \to 0,$$

and

$$\Phi(r) = C_1(1+[1-r,(1-r)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}]_1) \qquad \text{as } r \to 1-0.$$

Here $C_0$ and $C_1$ are non-zero constants. Other independent solutions of $\mathcal{L}y = \lambda y$ do not belong to $L^2(r^4\rho dr)$ both at $r \sim 0, r \sim 1$. To prove this, we use the following lemma:

**Lemma 2** *Let us consider the equation*

$$z\frac{d^2y}{dz^2} + b(z,z^a)\frac{dy}{dz} = c(z,z^a)y,$$

*where*

$$b(z,z^a) = a + [z,z^a]_1, \qquad c(z,z^a) = [z,z^a]_0,$$

*and let the positive number $a$ satisfy $a \geq 2$. Then 1) there is a solution $y_1$ of the form*

$$y_1 = 1 + [z,z^a]_1,$$

*and 2) there is a solution $y_2$ of the form*

$$y_2 = z^{-a+1}(1+[z,z^a]_1)$$

*provided $a \notin \mathbb{N}$, or*

$$y_2 = z^{-a+1}(1+[z,z^a]_1) + hy_1\log z$$

*provided $a \in \mathbb{N}$. Here $h$ is a constant which can vanish in some cases.*

For a proof, see [1], Chapter 4.

Let us consider the behavior of solutions at

$$z := 1 - r \to 0.$$

The the equation reads

$$-\frac{d^2y}{dz^2} + \Big(\frac{4}{1-z} + \frac{P_r}{P}\Big)\frac{dy}{dz} + \frac{(4-3\gamma)}{(1-z)}\frac{P_r}{\gamma P}y = \lambda\frac{\rho}{\gamma P}y,$$

and

$$\frac{P_r}{P} = -\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}\frac{1}{z}(1+[z,z^a]_1), \qquad \frac{\gamma P}{\rho} = \rho_1^{\gamma-1}z(1+[z,z^a]_1),$$

with $a = \dfrac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}$. Since $1 < \gamma \leq 2$, we have $a \geq 2$. Hence an application of the above lemma gives the assertion. Even if $N = 4(\gamma = 2)$, $y_2 \sim z^{-\frac{N}{2}+1}$ does not belong to $\mathfrak{X}$, and the boundary point $r = 1$ is of the limit point type.

# 3 Statement of the main result

We rewrite the equation (6) by using the linearized operator $\mathcal{L}$ defined by (8) as

$$\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t^2}+\Big(1+G_I\Big(y,r\frac{\partial y}{\partial r}\Big)\Big)\mathcal{L}y+G_{II}\Big(r,y,r\frac{\partial y}{\partial r}\Big)=0, \tag{15}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
G_I(y,v) &= (1+y)^2\Big(1+\frac{1}{\gamma}\partial_v G_2(y,v)\Big)-1,\\
G_{II}(r,y,v) &= \frac{P}{\rho r^2}G_{II0}(y,v)+\frac{P_r}{\rho r}G_{II1}(y,v),\\
G_{II0}(y,v) &= (1+y)^2(3\partial_v G_2-\partial_y G_2)v\\
&= -2\gamma(1+y)^{-2\gamma+1}(1+y+v)^{-\gamma-1}v^2,\\
G_{II1}(y,v) &= \frac{(1+y)^2}{\gamma}\partial_v G_2\cdot((-4+3\gamma)y+\gamma v)+\\
&\quad +H-4y(1+y)^2-(1+y)^2G_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned}
G_2(y,v) &:= G(y,v)-(3\gamma y+\gamma v)=[y,v]_2,\\
\partial_v G_2 &:= \frac{\partial}{\partial v}G_2=\frac{\partial G}{\partial v}-\gamma=[y,v]_1.
\end{aligned}$$

We have fixed a solution $y_1$ of the linearized equation $y_{tt}+\mathcal{L}y=0$, and we seek a solution $y$ of (6) or (15) of the form

$$y=\varepsilon y_1+\varepsilon w,$$

where $\varepsilon$ is a small positive parameter. Then the equation which $w$ should satisfy turns out to be

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial t^2}+\Big(1+\varepsilon a\Big(t,r,w,r\frac{\partial w}{\partial r},\varepsilon\Big)\Big)\mathcal{L}w+\varepsilon b\Big(t,r,w,r\frac{\partial w}{\partial r},\varepsilon\Big)=\\
&=\varepsilon c(t,r,\varepsilon),
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
a(t,r,w,\Omega,\varepsilon) &= \varepsilon^{-1}G_I(\varepsilon y_1+\varepsilon w,\varepsilon v_1+\varepsilon\Omega),\\
b(t,r,w,\Omega,\varepsilon) &= -(F_I+F_{II})+(F_I+F_{II})\Big|_{w=\Omega=0}\\
c(t,r,\varepsilon) &= (F_I+F_{II})\Big|_{w=\Omega=0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here $v_1$ stands for $r\partial y_1/\partial r$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
F_I &:= -\varepsilon^{-1}G_I(\varepsilon y_1+\varepsilon w,\varepsilon v_1+\varepsilon\Omega)\mathcal{L}y_1,\\
F_{II} &:= -\varepsilon^{-2}G_{II}(r,\varepsilon y_1+\varepsilon w,\varepsilon v_1+\varepsilon\Omega).
\end{aligned}$$

Then the main result of this study can be stated as follows:

**Theorem 1** *Assume that* $6/5 < \gamma \leq 2$ *and that* $\dfrac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}$ *is an integer. That is, we assume that* $\gamma$ *is either* $2, 3/2, 4/3,$ *or* $5/4$*. Then for any given* $T > 0$ *there is a sufficiently small positive* $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(T)$ *such that, for* $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$*, there is a solution* $w$ *of (16) such that* $w \in C^\infty([0,T]\times[0,1])$ *and*

$$\sup_{j+k\leq n} \left\| \Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Big)^j \Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\Big)^k w \right\|_{L^\infty([0,T]\times[0,1])} \leq C_n \varepsilon,$$

*or a solution* $y \in C^\infty([0,T]\times[0,1])$ *of (6) or (15) of the form*

$$y(t,r) = \varepsilon y_1(t,r) + O(\varepsilon^2),$$

*or a motion which can be expressed by the Lagrangian coordinates as*

$$r(t,m) = \bar{r}(m)(1 + \varepsilon y_1(t, \bar{r}(m)) + O(\varepsilon^2))$$

*for* $0 \leq t \leq T, 0 \leq m \leq M$*.*

**Remark.** The corresponding density distribution $\rho = \rho(t,r)$, where $r$ denotes the original Euler coordinate, satisfies

$$\rho(t,r) > 0 \text{ for } 0 \leq r < R_F(t), \qquad \rho(t,r) = 0 \text{ for } R_F(t) \leq r,$$

where

$$R_F(t) := r(t,M) = 1 + \varepsilon \sin\sqrt{\lambda}(t-t_0)\Phi(1) + O(\varepsilon^2).$$

Since $y(t,r)$ is smooth on $0 \leq r \leq 1$, we have

$$\rho(t,r) = C(t)(R_F(t) - r)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}(1 + O(R_F(t) - r))$$

as $r \to R_F(t) - 0$. Here $C(t)$ is positive and smooth in $t$.

Our task is to find the inverse image $\mathfrak{P}^{-1}(\varepsilon c)$ of the nonlinear mapping $\mathfrak{P}$ defined by

$$\mathfrak{P}(w) := \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial t^2} + (1+\varepsilon a)\mathcal{L}w + \varepsilon b. \tag{17}$$

Note $\mathfrak{P}(0) = 0$. It requires a property of the Fréchet derivative of $\mathfrak{P}$:

$$D\mathfrak{P}(w)h = h_{tt} + (1+\varepsilon a_1)\mathcal{L}h + \varepsilon a_{20}h + \varepsilon a_{21} r h_r, \tag{18}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_1(t,r) &= a\Big(t, r, w, r\frac{\partial w}{\partial r}, \varepsilon\Big), \\ a_{20}(t,r) &= \frac{\partial a}{\partial w}\mathcal{L}w + \frac{\partial b}{\partial w}, \\ a_{21}(t,r) &= \frac{\partial a}{\partial \Omega}\mathcal{L}w + \frac{\partial b}{\partial \Omega}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\Omega$ is the dummy of $r\partial w/\partial r$. We shall use the following observation:

**Proposition 5** *We have*

$$a_{21} = \frac{\gamma P}{\rho}(1+y)^{-2\gamma+2}(1+y+v)^{-\gamma-2}\Big((\gamma+1)\frac{\partial^2 Y}{\partial r^2} + \frac{4\gamma}{r}\frac{\partial Y}{\partial r} + \frac{2\varepsilon(\gamma-1)}{1+y}\Big(\frac{\partial Y}{\partial r}\Big)^2\Big),$$

*where*

$$Y = y_1 + w, \qquad y = \varepsilon Y, \qquad v = r\frac{\partial y}{\partial r} = \varepsilon r \frac{\partial Y}{\partial r}.$$

**Proof**. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial a}{\partial \Omega} &= \frac{\partial G_I}{\partial v} = \frac{(1+y)^2}{\gamma}\partial_v^2 G_2, \\ \frac{\partial b}{\partial \Omega} &= \frac{\partial G_I}{\partial v}\mathcal{L}y_1 + \varepsilon^{-1}\frac{\partial G_{II}}{\partial v}, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$a_{21} = \frac{(1+y)^2}{\gamma}\partial_v^2 G_2 \mathcal{L}(y_1+w) + \varepsilon^{-1}\frac{\partial G_{II}}{\partial v}.$$

On the other hand

$$\frac{\partial G_{II0}}{\partial v} = -2\gamma(1+y)^{-2\gamma+1}(1+y+v)^{-\gamma-2}\cdot(2(1+y)+(-\gamma+1)v)v$$

and

$$\frac{\partial G_{II1}}{\partial v} = \frac{(1+y)^2}{\gamma}\partial_v^2 G_2\cdot((-4+3\gamma)y+\gamma v).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} a_{21} &= \frac{(1+y)^2}{\gamma}\partial_v^2 G_2 \cdot \Big(\mathcal{L}Y + \frac{P_r}{\rho r}((-4+3\gamma)Y+\gamma V)\Big) + \\ &\quad -\varepsilon^{-1}\frac{2\gamma P}{\rho r^2}(1+y)^{-2\gamma+1}(1+y+v)^{-\gamma-2}(2(1+y)+(-\gamma+1)v)v \\ &= -(1+y)^2\frac{P}{\rho}\partial_v^2 G_2\cdot\Big(\frac{\partial^2 Y}{\partial r^2} + \frac{4}{r}\frac{\partial Y}{\partial r}\Big) + \\ &\quad -\frac{2\gamma P}{\rho r^2}(1+y)^{-2\gamma+1}(1+y+v)^{-\gamma-2}(2(1+y)+(-\gamma+1)v)V. \end{aligned}$$

Here $V$ stands for $r\partial Y/\partial r$. Using

$$\partial_v^2 G_2 = -\gamma(\gamma+1)(1+y)^{-2\gamma}(1+y+v)^{-\gamma-2},$$

we get the result. ■

# 4 Proof of the main result

## 4.1

The proof of the main result presented here depends strongly on the preceding discussions in [3] and [7]. But a completely parallel treatment might draw difficulties even if the linearized operator $\mathcal{L}$ is simplified by $\Lambda$, for the structure of

$\Lambda^m$ is complicated. Hence we introduce a cut off function in order to divide the difficulties.

Let us fix a function $\omega \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $0 \leq \omega \leq 1, \omega(x) = 1$ for $x \leq 1/3$, and $\omega(x) = 0$ for $2/3 \leq x$. For any function $y$ of $0 \leq x \leq 1$, we put

$$y^0(x) = \omega(x)y(x), \qquad y^1(x) = (1 - \omega(x))y(x). \tag{19}$$

Then, $y = y^0 + y^1$, $\mathrm{supp}[y^0](:=$ the support of $y^0) \subset [0, 2/3]$ and $\mathrm{supp}[y^1] \subset [1/3, 1]$.

We consider the operators

$$\begin{aligned} \triangle_0 &:= x\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{5}{2}\frac{d}{dx} && (20) \\ \triangle_1 &:= z\frac{d^2}{dz^2} + \frac{N}{2}\frac{d}{dz} && (21) \end{aligned}$$

Here and hereafter the letter $z$ is used for the variable

$$z := 1 - x \tag{22}$$

First of all we introduce the norm

$$\|y\|_m := \sup_{0 \leq j \leq m} \{\|(-\triangle_0)^j y^0\|_{L^\infty}, \|(-\triangle_1)^j y^1\|_{L^\infty}\}.$$

Clearly we have the equivalence

$$\|y\|_0 \leq \|y\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2\|y\|_0.$$

## 4.2

We shall apply the Nash-Moser theorem ([2], p. 171, III.1.1.1.) to the functional spaces

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{E} &:= C^\infty([0, T] \times [0, 1]) \\ \mathfrak{E}_0 &:= \{w \in \mathfrak{E} \quad | \quad w|_{t=0} = \frac{\partial w}{\partial t}\Big|_{t=0} = 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

and the nonlinear mapping

$$\mathfrak{P}(w) = \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial t^2} + (1 + \varepsilon a)\mathcal{L}w + \varepsilon b \tag{17}$$

On $\mathfrak{E}$ we introduce the gradings of norms

$$\|y\|_n^{(\infty)} := \sup_{0 \leq \alpha + \beta \leq n, 0 \leq t \leq T} \Big\|\Big(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2}\Big)^\alpha y\Big\|_\beta$$

and

$$\|y\|_n^{(2)}\Big(\sum_{0\leq\alpha+\beta\leq n}\int_0^T\Big\|\Big(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2}\Big)^{\alpha}y\Big\|_{\mathfrak{X},\beta}^2 dt\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where

$$\|y\|_{\mathfrak{X},\beta}:=\Big(\sum_{0\leq j\leq\beta}\Big(\|(-\triangle_0)^j y^0\|_{\mathfrak{X}_0}^2+\|(-\triangle_1)^j y^1\|_{\mathfrak{X}_1}^2\Big)\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Here $\mathfrak{X}_0=L^2([0,1]_x,x^{\frac{3}{2}}dx)$ and $\mathfrak{X}_1=L^2([0,1]_z,z^{\frac{N}{2}-1}dz)$.

Then the Sobolev imbedding theorem shown in [3] implies the equivalence of these gradings, say,

$$\frac{1}{C}\|y\|_n^{(2)}\leq\|y\|_n^{(\infty)}\leq C\|y\|_{n+\sigma}^{(2)},$$

where $\sigma/2>\max(5/2,N/2)$.

Moreover $\mathfrak{E}$ and its closed subspace $\mathfrak{E}_0$ are tame spaces. In fact, we can consider the tame mappings $\Phi:\mathfrak{E}\rightarrow\mathfrak{E}^0\times\mathfrak{E}^1:y\mapsto(y^0,y^1)$ and $\Psi:(y_0,y_1)\mapsto y_0+y_1$, where $\mathfrak{E}^0$ and $\mathfrak{E}^1$ are copies of the space "$\mathfrak{E}$" in [3] endowed with the operators $\triangle_0$ and $\triangle_1$ respectively. These spaces are tame as claimed in [3]. Then $\mathfrak{E}^0\times\mathfrak{E}^1$ is tame as the cartesian product of tame spaces ([2], p.136, II.1.3.4.) and $\mathfrak{E}$ is tame as a tame direct summand of a tame space ([2], p.136. II.1.3.3.).

In order to claim that the mapping $\mathfrak{P}$ is tame, it is sufficient to use the following propositions, which are parallel to [3], Propositions 7,8,9:

**Proposition 6** *For any $m\in\mathbb{N}$ there is a constant $C$ such that*

$$\Big\|r\frac{dw}{dr}\Big\|_m\leq C\|w\|_{m+1}.$$

**Proof**: We have

$$\begin{aligned}r\frac{dw}{dr} &= r\sqrt{x(1-x)}\rho^{\frac{-\gamma+1}{2}}\frac{dw}{dx}\\ &= \begin{cases}2\rho_0^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}}x(1+[x^2]_1)\dfrac{dw}{dx}\\ -\rho_1^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}}(1+[z,z^{\frac{N}{2}}]_1)\dfrac{dw}{dz}.\end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Hence [3], Proposition 7 implies the assertion. ■

**Remark 2**: Using the integral representations in Proposition 4, we can deduce

$$\Big|\frac{dw}{dx}(x)\Big|\leq C\|\Lambda y\|_{L^\infty}.$$

But it may be difficult to write down a simple integral representation for $\Lambda^m\dfrac{d}{dx}$.

**Proposition 7** *For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a constant $C$ such that*

$$\|f \cdot g\|_m \leq C(\|f\|_m \|g\|_0 + \|f\|_0 \|g\|_m).$$

**Proposition 8** *If $F(x, y)$ is a smooth function of $x$ and $y$, then for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a constant $C$ such that*

$$\|F(x, y(x)\|_m \leq C(1 + \|y\|_m).$$

### 4.3

Let us consider energy estimates for the higher order derivatives of the solution of the equation

$$D\mathfrak{P}(w)h = g,$$

where $h \in \mathfrak{E}_0, g \in \mathfrak{E}$, while $w \in \mathfrak{E}_0$ is fixed, and

$$D\mathfrak{P}(w)h = \frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial t^2} + (1 + \varepsilon a_1)\mathcal{L}h + \varepsilon a_{20}h + \varepsilon a_{21} r \frac{\partial h}{\partial r}. \tag{18}$$

Using the relations

$$\begin{aligned} \omega \mathcal{L}h - \mathcal{L}(\omega h) &= \omega_2 h + 2\omega_1 \frac{\partial h}{\partial r}, \\ \omega r \frac{\partial h}{\partial r} - r \frac{\partial}{\partial r}(\omega h) &= r\omega_1 h, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\omega_1 = \frac{d\omega}{dr}, \qquad \omega_2 = \frac{1}{\rho r^4} \frac{d}{dr} \gamma P r^4 \frac{d\omega}{dr},$$

we can rewrite the equation (18) to the following system of simultaneous equations:

$$\begin{cases} \mathfrak{M}_0 h^0 &= g^0 - \alpha_1 \dfrac{\partial h^1}{\partial r} - \alpha_0 h^1 \\ \mathfrak{M}_1 h^1 &= g^1 + \alpha_1 \dfrac{\partial h^0}{\partial r} + \alpha_0 h^0, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}_0 &= \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} + (1 + \varepsilon a_1)\mathcal{L} + \varepsilon a_{20} + \varepsilon a_{21} r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \\ &\quad + \alpha_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \alpha_0, \\ \mathfrak{M}_1 &= \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} + (1 + \varepsilon a_1)\mathcal{L} + \varepsilon a_{20} + \varepsilon a_{21} r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \\ &\quad - \alpha_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial r} - \alpha_0, \\ \alpha_1 &= 2(1 + \varepsilon a_1)\omega_1, \\ \alpha_0 &= (1 + \varepsilon a_1)\omega_2 - \varepsilon a_{21} r \omega_1. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} &= -\Lambda + L_1\frac{d}{dx} + L_0, \\
\Lambda &= \begin{cases} (1-x)\triangle_0 + \dfrac{N}{2}x\dfrac{d}{dx} \\ (1-z)\triangle_1 + \dfrac{5}{2}z\dfrac{d}{dz}. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we can write

$$\mathfrak{M}_0 = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - a^0(t,x)\triangle_0 + b^0_1(t,x)x\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + b^0_0(t,x),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
a^0 &= (1+\varepsilon a_1)(1-x), \\
b^0_1 &= -\frac{N}{2} + (1+\varepsilon a_1)\frac{L_1}{x} + (\varepsilon a_{21}r + \alpha_1)\frac{1}{x}\frac{dx}{dr}, \\
b^0_0 &= L_0 + \varepsilon a_{20} + \alpha_0,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{M}_1 = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - a^1(t,z)\triangle_1 + b^1_1(t,z)z\frac{\partial}{\partial z} + b^1_0(t,z),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
a^1 &= (1+\varepsilon a_1)(1-z), \\
b^1_1 &= -\frac{5}{2} - (1+\varepsilon a_1)\frac{L_1}{z} + (\varepsilon a_{21}r - \alpha_1)\frac{1}{z}\frac{dz}{dr}, \\
b^0_0 &= L_0 + \varepsilon a_{20} - \alpha_0.
\end{aligned}$$

First, if $|\varepsilon a_1| \leq 1/2$, then $a^0 \geq 1/6$ for $x \leq 2/3$. Since the operator $\mathfrak{M}_0$ acts on functions whose supports are contained in $0 \leq x \leq 2/3$, we can assume $a^0 \geq 1/12$ everywhere.

Since $L_1 = [x]_1$, we have $L_1/x \in C^\infty[0,1]$.

Since

$$\frac{r}{x}\frac{dx}{dr} = 2 + [x]_1,$$

and since $\alpha_1 = 0$ for $x \leq 1/3$, we see $b^0_1 \in C^\infty([0,T]\times[0,1])$.

Clearly $b^0_0 \in C^\infty$.

On the other hand, if $|\varepsilon a_1| \leq 1/2$, then $a^1 \geq 1/6$ for $z \leq 2/3$. Hence we can assume $a^1 \geq 1/12$ everywhere for $\mathfrak{M}_1$ acting on functions whose supports are in $0 \leq z \leq 2/3$.

Since $L_1 = [z, z^{\frac{N}{2}}]_1$ and since $N/2 \in \mathbb{N}$, we see $L_1/z \in C^\infty([0,1]_z)$. Although

$$\frac{r}{z}\frac{dz}{dx} = -\rho_1^{\frac{-\gamma+1}{2}}\frac{1}{z}(1 + [z, z^{\frac{N}{2}}]_1),$$

we know $a_{21} \in z\cdot C^\infty$ thanks to Proposition 5. By this observation and the fact that $\alpha_1 = 0$ for $z \leq 1/3$, we can claim that $b^1_1 \in C^\infty([0,T]\times[0,1])$.

Clearly $b^1_0 \in C^\infty$.

Since $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = 0$ for $x \leq 1/3$ and $2/3 \leq x$ (or $z \leq 1/3$), there are constants $A^*, B^*$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big\| \alpha_1 \frac{\partial h^1}{\partial r} \Big\|_{\mathfrak{X}_0} &\leq A^* \Big\| \sqrt{z} \frac{\partial h^1}{\partial z} \Big\|_{\mathfrak{X}_1}, \\
\|\alpha_0 h^1\|_{\mathfrak{X}_0} &\leq B^* \|h^1\|_{\mathfrak{X}_1}, \\
\Big\| \alpha_1 \frac{\partial h^0}{\partial r} \Big\|_{\mathfrak{X}_1} &\leq A^* \Big\| \sqrt{x} \frac{\partial h^0}{\partial x} \Big\|_{\mathfrak{X}_0}, \\
\|\alpha_0 h^0\|_{\mathfrak{X}_1} &\leq B^* \|h^0\|_{\mathfrak{X}_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, putting

$$\begin{aligned}
A_0 &= \|a^0_{,t}\|_{L^\infty} + \sqrt{12}\|\sqrt{x} a^0_{,x} + b^0_1\|_{L^\infty} + \sqrt{12}A^*, \\
B_0 &= \|b^0_0\|_{L^\infty} + B^*, \\
A_1 &= \|a^1_{,t}\|_{L^\infty} + \sqrt{12}\|\sqrt{z} a^1_{,z} + b^1_1\|_{L^\infty} + \sqrt{12}A^*, \\
B_1 &= \|b^1_0\|_{L^\infty} + B^*, \\
A &= \max\{A_0, A_1\}, \\
B &= \max\{B_0, B_1\}, \\
E_0(t) &= \int_0^1 ((h^0_{,t})^2 + a^0(t,x)x(h^0_{,x})^2)x^{\frac{3}{2}} dx, \\
E_1(t) &= \int_0^1 ((h^1_{,t})^2 + a^1(t,z)z(h^1_{,z})^2)z^{\frac{N}{2}-1} dz, \\
E(t) &= \max\{E_0(t), E_1(t)\},
\end{aligned}$$

we have the estimate

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{dE}{dt} \leq AE + BE^{1/2}\int_0^t E(t')^{1/2} dt' + E^{1/2}\|g\|_{\mathfrak{X},0}.$$

Here we recall

$$\|g\|_{\mathfrak{X},0} = (\|g^0\|^2_{\mathfrak{X}_0} + \|g^1\|^2_{\mathfrak{X}_1})^{1/2}.$$

This is the energy estimate for $(h^0, h^1)$.

Similarly the discussion of energy estimates of the higher derivatives of $h$ developed in [3] and [7] can be applied to the simultaneous equations for $(h^0, h^1)$ to get the tame estimate of $V\mathfrak{P}(w) : g \mapsto h$. This completes the proof.

# 5 Concluding remark

In order that the equilibrium satisfy that $\bar{\rho}^{\gamma-1}$ is analytic at the free boundary $r = R$, we assumed that $N$ is even. But $\gamma = 5/3 (N = 5)$ for monoatomic gas, and $\gamma = 7/5 (N = 7)$ for the air. Therefore it is desired that the result will be extended to the case that $N$ is an odd integer. For the case that $N$ is not an integer, we may try quite other approach than the present application of the Nash-Moser therem. This is an interesting open problem in view of physical applications.

# References

[1] E. A. Coddington and N. Levinson, *Theory of Ordinary Differential Equations*, McGraw-Hill, 1955.

[2] R. Hamilton, The inverse function theorem of Nash and Moser, Bull. American Math.Soc.,7 (1982), 65-2232.

[3] C.-H. Hsu, S.-S. Lin, T. Makino and C.-R. Yang, An applications of Nash-Moser theorem to smooth solutions of one-dimensional compressible Euler equations with gravity, preprint, arXiv:1208.3732.

[4] D. D. Joseph and T. S. Lundgren, Quasilinear Dirichlet problems driven by positive sources, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal., 49(1972/73), 241-269.

[5] S. Lefschetz, Differential Equations: Geometric Theory, Interscience, 1957; Dover, 1977.

[6] S.-S. Lin, Stability of gaseous stars in spherically symmetric motions, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 28 (1997), 539-569.

[7] T. Makino, On spherically symmetric motions of the atmosphere surrounding a planet governed by the compressible Euler equations, preprint, arXiv: 1210.3670.

[8] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics, Vol. II, Fourier Analysis, Self-Adjointness*, Academic Press, 1975.

[9] W. Wasow, *Asymptotic Expansions for Ordinary Differential Equations*, Interscience, 1965; Dover, 1987.